

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-23 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1-3, 7-9, 12-13 and 19-21 are amended. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

A. The Office Action objects to the drawings. Applicant respectfully submits the above amendments obviate the grounds for the objection. Withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

B. The Office Action objects to claims 1-4, 8-9, 12-13, 15-21 for informalities. Applicant respectfully submits the above amendments obviate the grounds for the objection. Withdrawal of the objection of claims 1-4, 8-9, 12-13 and 15-21 is respectfully requested.

C. The Office Action rejects claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,747,974 to Hayashi and U.S. Patent No. 5,539,744 to Chu et al. (hereafter "Chu"). Since Hayashi and Chu, individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest recited features of the claims, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that at least features of an AAL2 switch for multicast including a plurality of receiver circuits, a plurality of memories and a plurality of transmitter circuits, wherein at least one memory stores an

indication that said at least one CPS packet is to be output by two or more transmitter circuits and combinations thereof. The Office Action admits that Hayashi does not disclose an AAL2 switch for multicast. See page 4, lines 1-2 of the Office Action. In contrast to features recited in claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Hayashi expressly discloses that for an input ATM cell received through input terminal 411 a destination is one uniquely identified output port among M output ports 10-1 through 10-M as shown in Figure 8. See lines 22-30 of column 8, lines 2-5 and 61-67 of column 14, lines 47-58 of column 17 and lines 9-29 of column 18 and Figures 1 and 4 of Hayashi. Further, Applicant respectfully submits that Hayashi's teaching of one unique identified output port teaches away from a multicast function for an AAL2 switch, and therefore teaches away from the asserted combination with Chu.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits it would not be obvious to combine Chu with Hayashi. However, even if combined, Applicant respectfully submits that Hayashi does not teach or suggest at least features of an AAL2 switch for multicast including a plurality of receiver circuits, a plurality of memories, and a plurality of transmitter circuits wherein at least one memory stores an indication that said at least one CPS packet is to be output by two or more transmitter circuits and combinations thereof as recited in claim 1 and lacking from Hayashi. Further, Applicant respectfully submits Chu does not

teach or suggest specific features of an AAL2 switch recited in claim 1 and lacking from Hayashi. See column 15, line 54-column 16, line 38 and Figure 5 of Chu. Further, Applicant respectfully submits Chu does not teach or suggest any modifications to its disclosure that would result in at least features of an AAL2 switch for multicast, wherein at least one memory stores an indication that said at least one CPS packet is to be output by two or more transmitter circuits and combinations thereof as recited in claim 1. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Hayashi and Chu, individually or in combination, would not result in at least features of a plurality of memory receiver circuits, a plurality of memories and a plurality of transmitter circuits and combinations thereof as recited in claim 1.

With respect to claim 8, Applicant respectfully submits that Hayashi and Chu, individually or in combination, would not result in at least features wherein a subset of transmitter circuits transmit said AAL2 packet for a multicast responsive to said indication and combinations thereof as recited.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits claim 1 defines patentable subject matter. Claims 13 and 19 define patentable subject matter for at least reasons similar to claim 1. Claims 2-12, 14-18 and 20-23 depend from claims 1, 13 and 19, respectively, and therefore also define patentable subject matter for at least that

Serial No. 10/020,872
Reply to Office Action of October 4, 2005

Docket No. HI-0062

reason as well as their additionally recited features. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-23 under §103 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, **Carl R. Wesolowski**, at the telephone number listed below.

Serial No. 10/020,872
Reply to Office Action of October 4, 2005

Docket No. HI-0062

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Carl R. Wesolowski
Registration No. 40,372

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3701 DYK/CRW:jld
Date: February 3, 2006

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610